



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/706,737

11/07/2000

Vittorio Castelli

YOR92000549US1

8221

48150

7590

07/06/2005

MCGINN & GIBB, PLLC
8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD
SUITE 200
VIENNA, VA 22182-3817

EXAMINER

DESTA, ELIAS

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2857

DATE MAILED: 07/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/706,737

Applicant(s)

CASTELLI ET AL.

Examiner

Elias Desta

Art Unit

2857

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 April 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Detailed Action

Drawing/Specification

1. The Examiner accepts the amendment filed on 4/25/2005 to overcome the objections to Figs. 11, 12, 13 and 15 and the specification.

Explanation of Rejection

Claim rejection – 35 U.S.C. 112

2. Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite in that it fails to show support and carry out the desired results of the preamble.

For instance, claims 1, 28 and 29 in the preamble state that they are drawn to “forecasting of computing resources” and yet never appear to accomplish such desired intended results. The claims are, therefore, incomplete and indefinite how such function is ever accomplished. The mere fact of “preprocessing data to be used for forecasting of computing resources” does not make the claim definite.

As to claims 2-27 (dependent claims), said claims are rejected to the extent that they inherit flaws of their parent claim 1.

Claim rejection – 35 U.S.C. 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because these claims are interpreted as a series of preprocessing instructions to an operator representing an abstract idea that lacks tangibility.

For instance, claims 1, 28 and 29 recite detecting spikes, jumps, removing spikes and jumps from observation without having a method clearly in the technological arts. Further, the preamble mentions it is “in a computer system”; the body of the claim does not refer back to that computer so it does not carry that much weight. As a result the method steps could be done on paper or even mentally. Hence, the steps taken to do the forecasting of computing resources is manipulation of abstract ideas without practical application. The mere fact of “preprocessing data to be used for forecasting of computing resources” does not make the claim statutory.

A claim is limited to a practical application when the method, as claimed, produces a concrete, tangible and useful result; i.e., the method recites a step or act of producing something that is concrete, tangible and useful. See AT & T, 172 F.3d at 1358, 50 USPQ2d at 1452. Likewise, a machine claim is statutory

Art Unit: 2857

when the machine, as claimed, produces a concrete, tangible and useful result (as in State Street, 149 F.3d at 1373, 47 USPQ2d at 1601) and/or when a specific machine is being claimed (as in Alappat, 33 F.3d at 1544, 31 USPQ2d at 1557 (in banc)). For example, a computer process that simply calculates a mathematical algorithm that models noise is nonstatutory; whereas, a digital filtering process for removing noise from a digital signal comprising the steps of calculating a mathematical algorithm to produce a correction signal and subtracting the correction signal from the digital signal to remove the noise is statutory.

As to claims 2-27 (dependent claims), said claims are rejected to the extent that they inherit flaws of their parent claim 1.

Response to Argument

5. As noted above, the Examiner still maintains the 35 U.S.C. §112 and 101 rejections as it applies to claims 1-29.

In reference to claims 1 and 28: The mere fact of “preprocessing data to be used for forecasting of computing resources” does not make the claims statutory or definite.

A digital filtering process for removing noise from a digital signal comprising the steps of calculating a mathematical algorithm to produce a

Art Unit: 2857

correction signal and subtracting the correction signal from the digital signal to remove the noise is statutory. Hence, none of the steps carried out in claims 1 28 or 29 include a computation and correction using a mathematical algorithm to remove the noise or create a smooth version of the signal.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant disclosure

- Selesnick (IEEE Article, 'The Slantlet Transform') teaches a discrete wavelet transform (DWT) that is implemented using an orthogonal DWT.

7. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In

Art Unit: 2857

no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elias Desta whose telephone number is (571)-272-2214. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Thu (8:30-7:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marc S. Hoff can be reached on (571)-272-2216. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)-872-9306 for regular communications and for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571)-272-1750

Elias Desta
Examiner
Art Unit 2857

-ed

June 28, 2005

Carol S. W. Tsan

Carl S. W. Li